UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

FieldTurf USA, Inc., et al,	Case No. 10-12492 Hon. Stephen J. Murphy, III
Plaintiffs,	
v.	
Astroturf, LLC,	
Defendant/	
Astroturf, LLC,	
Counter-Claimant	
v.	
FieldTurf Tarkett, Inc., et al,	
Counter-Defendants	
1	

VERDICT FORM

	Question 1: Has FieldTurf proven by a p	reponderance of the evidence that AstroTurf
infring	ed claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,723,412 ("tl	ne '412 patent")?
	Yes X	No
	Question 2: If you answered "Yes" to Que	estion 1 above, was AstroTurf's infringement
willful	? (If you answered "No" to Question 1 above	e, do not answer this question.)
	Yes X	No
	Question 3: Has Astroturf proven by clear	and convincing evidence that Claim 12 of the
'412 p	atent was obvious?	
	Yes	No X
	Question 4: Has Astroturf proven by clear	and convincing evidence that Claim 12 of the
'412 p	atent was anticipated?	
	Yes	No X
	Question 5: If you found that AstroTurf ha	s infringed claim 12 of the '412 patent and
you ha	ive not found such claim to be obvious or ant	icipated, set forth the amount that FieldTurf
has sh	own by a preponderance of the evidence it is	entitled to recover as damages:
	Lost Profits:	\$ 20,281,000
	Reasonable Royalty:	\$ 20,281,000 \$ 9,719,000
	reasonable regulty.	·

Question 6: Has AstroTurf proven by a preponderance of the evidence that FieldTurf		
used false advertising or competed unfairly?		
Yes	No X	
Question 7: If you found that FieldTurf used false advertising or competed unfairly, is		
AstroTurf entitled to \$1 in nominal damages?		
Yes	No X	
Dated: <u>Oct 9, 2015</u>	s/Jury Foreperson In compliance with the Privacy Policy adopted by the Judicial Conference, the verdict form with the original signature has been filed under seal.	